

## **Exhibit C**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE GOOGLE DIGITAL ADVERTISING  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

No. 21-md-3010 (PKC)

*This Stipulation Relates To:*

THE STATE OF TEXAS, *et al.*,

*Plaintiffs,*

- against -

GOOGLE LLC,

*Defendant.*

No. 21-CV-6841 (PKC)

**SECOND STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING  
STATE PLAINTIFFS' STATE LAW CLAIMS**

Defendant Google LLC (*Google*) and Plaintiffs State of Texas, State of Alaska, State of Arkansas, State of Florida, State of Idaho, State of Indiana, Commonwealth of Kentucky, State of Louisiana, State of Mississippi, State of Missouri, State of Montana, State of Nevada, State of North Dakota, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, State of South Carolina, State of South Dakota, and State of Utah (collectively *State Plaintiffs*; the State Plaintiffs and Google combined are the *Parties*) stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS, paragraphs 546 through 602 (Count V) of State Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195) (*TAC*) describe State Plaintiffs' state antitrust claims;

Formatted: Font: Italic

WHEREAS, on September 13, 2022, the Court issued its Opinion and Order on Google's Motion to Dismiss Counts I Through IV of the States' Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 308, the *Opinion and Order*);

WHEREAS, on November 18, 2022, the Court issued Pre-Trial Order No. 4, ordering State Plaintiffs and Google to meet and confer on a stipulation as to the effect of the Opinion and Order on any of the State Plaintiffs' state law claims and to report to the Court within 21 days (*see* ECF No. 392, ¶ 4);

WHEREAS, on December 9, 2022, pursuant to Pre-Trial Order No. 4, the Parties submitted a stipulation (the *First Stipulation*) to the Court regarding the effect of the Opinion and Order on any of the State Plaintiffs' state law claims (*see* ECF No. 415);

WHEREAS, paragraph 2 of the First Stipulation stated that, "[a]ny state law antitrust claim is deemed dismissed to the extent that it is based on conduct alleged to serve as a basis for a federal antitrust claim that the Opinion and Order dismissed";

WHEREAS, on December 14, 2022, the Court so ordered the Parties' First Stipulation, and in so doing, added the following proviso: "[b]y February 24, 2023, the parties shall submit a stipulation describing with particularity, the claims or portions of claims governed by paragraph 2 [of the First Stipulation]," (ECF No. 417, at 3); and

NOW THEREFORE, the Parties, through their respective counsel, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the ~~Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195)~~TAC based on allegations that the Network Bidding Agreement between Google and Meta Platforms, Inc. (f/k/a as Facebook) constitutes an illegal contract, combination or conspiracy, such claim is hereby deemed dismissed.

2. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the ~~Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195)~~TAC based on allegations that Google’s use of Encrypted User IDs constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive in the markets alleged in the TAC.

**Commented [A1]:** Google: This language is meant to ensure that the State Plaintiffs aren’t agreeing that Judge Castel’s opinion forecloses plaintiffs from claims beyond those asserted in plaintiffs’ complaint. To be clear, we have no present intention of asserting this claim as to any market.

3. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the ~~Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195)~~TAC based on allegations that ~~the effects of~~ Google’s use of Dynamic Allocation (“DA”) constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization on markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.

4. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the ~~Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195)~~TAC based on allegations that ~~the effects of~~ Google’s use of Enhanced Dynamic Allocation (“EDA”) constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization on markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.

5. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the ~~Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195)~~TAC based on allegations that ~~the effects of~~ Google’s use of Dynamic Revenue Share (“DRS”) constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization on markets for publisher ad servers, large-advertiser buying tools, and/or small-advertiser buying tools, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive.

6. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim ~~in the Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195)~~TAC based on allegations that the effects of Google’s use of Reserve Price Optimization (“RPO”) constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive in the markets alleged in the TAC.

7. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the ~~Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195)~~ TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Exchange Bidding constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive in the markets alleged in the TAC.

8. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the ~~Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195)~~ TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Accelerated Mobile Pages ("AMP") constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege that such conduct is anticompetitive in the markets alleged in the TAC.

9. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges a state antitrust claim in the ~~Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195)~~ TAC based on allegations that Google's use of Privacy Sandbox constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization, such claim is deemed to be unripe for determination.

10. To the extent that any State Plaintiff alleges in the ~~TAC Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 195)~~ a state antitrust claim based on allegations that Google's use of ~~Dynamic Allocation~~ DA, Google's use of ~~Dynamic Revenue Share~~ RS, Google's combined use of ~~Dynamic DA Allocation~~ and ~~Dynamic Revenue Share~~ RS constitutes monopolization or attempted monopolization, such claim is deemed to have failed to allege such conduct has continuing adverse effects.

11. ~~As a result of the Opinion and Order, No State Plaintiff will pursue any state antitrust claim described in paragraphs 1 through 10 of this Stipulation. No State Plaintiff has asserted or will further pursue any claim in this litigation that assert that~~ Google's use of Encrypted User IDs, ~~DA, EDA, DRS, RPO, Exchange Bidding, and AMP, or Privacy Sandbox~~ violates any state antitrust law ~~other than those~~ prohibiting monopolization or attempted monopolization. It is expressly

**Commented [A2]:** Because Privacy Sandbox was dismissed for lack of ripeness and not on the merits, it should not be included in here. Also, as to DRS and DA, Judge Castel found that they were anticompetitive in the exchange market, so they shouldn't be included here.

~~understood that this stipulation expressly does not address apply to whether the State Plaintiffs may seek and/or obtain get-discovery on Google's use of Encrypted User IDs, DA, EDA, DRS, RPO, Exchange Bidding, and AMP. This stipulation does~~

**IT IS SO STIPULATED.**

Dated: February 24, 2023

*For Plaintiff States of Texas, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana (The Lanier Law Firm only), Mississippi, North Dakota, South Carolina, and South Dakota:*

/s/ Ashley Keller

Ashley Keller  
Admitted Pro Hac Vice  
[ack@kellerpostman.com](mailto:ack@kellerpostman.com)  
Jason A. Zweig  
[jaz@kellerpostman.com](mailto:jaz@kellerpostman.com)  
Brooke Clason Smith  
[brooke.smith@kellerpostman.com](mailto:brooke.smith@kellerpostman.com)  
150 N. Riverside Plaza, Suite 4100  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 741-5220  
Zina Bash  
[zina.bash@kellerpostman.com](mailto:zina.bash@kellerpostman.com)  
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 500  
Austin, TX 78701  
(501) 690-0990  
**KELLER POSTMAN LLC**

/s/ Mark Lanier

W. Mark Lanier (*lead counsel*)  
Texas Bar No. 11934600  
[Mark.Lanier@LanierLawFirm.com](mailto:Mark.Lanier@LanierLawFirm.com)  
Alex J. Brown  
[Alex.Brown@LanierLawFirm.com](mailto:Alex.Brown@LanierLawFirm.com)  
Zeke DeRose III  
[Zeke.DeRose@LanierLawFirm.com](mailto:Zeke.DeRose@LanierLawFirm.com)  
10940 W. Sam Houston Parkway N. Suite 100  
Houston, Texas 77064  
Telephone: (713) 659-5200  
Facsimile: (713) 659-2204  
**THE LANIER LAW FIRM, P.C.**

*Attorneys for Plaintiff States of Texas, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana (The Lanier Law Firm only), Mississippi, North Dakota, South Carolina, and South Dakota*

/s/ DRAFT

Eric Mahr  
FRESHFIELDS BRUCKHAUS DERINGER US LLP  
700 13th Street, NW  
10th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 777-4545  
Email: [eric.mahr@freshfields.com](mailto:eric.mahr@freshfields.com)

Justina K. Sessions  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
Professional Corporation

One Market Plaza  
Spear Tower, Suite 3300  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 947-2197  
Email: jsessions@wsgr.com

*Counsel for Defendant Google LLC*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF TEXAS:

KEN PAXTON  
Attorney General

/s/ Shawn E. Cowles

Brent Webster, First Assistant Attorney  
General of Texas

[Brent.Webster@oag.texas.gov](mailto:Brent.Webster@oag.texas.gov)

Grant Dorfman, Deputy First Assistant  
Attorney General

[Grant.Dorfman@oag.texas.gov](mailto:Grant.Dorfman@oag.texas.gov)

Aaron Reitz, Deputy Attorney General for  
Legal Strategy [Aaron.Reitz@oag.texas.gov](mailto:Aaron.Reitz@oag.texas.gov)

Shawn E. Cowles, Deputy Attorney  
General for Civil Litigation

[Shawn.Cowles@oag.texas.gov](mailto:Shawn.Cowles@oag.texas.gov) Nanette

DiNunzio, Associate Deputy Attorney  
General for Civil Litigation

[Nanette.Dinunzio@oag.texas.gov](mailto:Nanette.Dinunzio@oag.texas.gov)

James R. Lloyd, Chief, Antitrust  
Division

[James.Lloyd@oag.texas.gov](mailto:James.Lloyd@oag.texas.gov)

Trevor Young, Deputy Chief,  
Antitrust Division

[Trevor.Young@oag.texas.gov](mailto:Trevor.Young@oag.texas.gov)

Ralph Molina, Assistant Attorney General,  
General Litigation Division

[Ralph.Molina@oag.texas.gov](mailto:Ralph.Molina@oag.texas.gov)

**OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS**

P.O. Box 12548

Austin, TX 78711-2548

(512) 936-1674

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Texas*



FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF ALASKA:

TREG R. TAYLOR  
Attorney General

By : /s/ Jeff Pickett  
Jeff Pickett  
Senior Assistant Attorney General, Special Litigation Section  
[jeff.pickett@alaska.gov](mailto:jeff.pickett@alaska.gov)

*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Alaska*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF ARKANSAS:

TIM GRIFFIN  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

By: /s/ Johnathan R. Carter  
Johnathan R. Carter – AR Bar # 2007105 Assistant  
Attorney General  
Office of the Arkansas Attorney General 323 Center  
Street, Suite 200  
Little Rock, AR 72201 Phone:  
501.682.8063  
Fax: 501.682.8118  
Email: [Johnathan.Carter@Arkansasag.gov](mailto:Johnathan.Carter@Arkansasag.gov)

*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Arkansas*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF FLORIDA:

ASHLEY MOODY, Attorney General

/s/ R. Scott Palmer

R. SCOTT PALMER, Special Counsel, Complex Enforcement  
Chief, FL Bar No. 220353

JOHN GUARD, Chief Deputy Attorney General

LEE ISTRAIL, Assistant Attorney General

CHRISTOPHER KNIGHT, Assistant Attorney General

ANDREW BUTLER, Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General, State of Florida

PL-01 The Capitol

Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Phone: 850-414-3300

Email: [scott.palmer@myfloridalegal.com](mailto:scott.palmer@myfloridalegal.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Florida*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF IDAHO:

RAUL R. LABRADOR  
Attorney General

/s/ John K. Olson

John K. Olson, Acting Division Chief, Consumer Protection Division

Consumer Protection Division  
Office of the Attorney General 954  
W. Jefferson Street, 2nd Floor  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, Idaho 83720-0010  
Telephone: (208) 334-2424  
[brett.delange@ag.idaho.gov](mailto:brett.delange@ag.idaho.gov)  
[john.olson@ag.idaho.gov](mailto:john.olson@ag.idaho.gov)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Idaho*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF INDIANA:

THEODORE E. ROKITA  
Attorney General

The Office of the Indiana Attorney General

By:   
Scott Barnhart  
Chief Counsel and Director of Consumer Protection  
Indiana Atty. No. 25474-82  
Indiana Government Center South – 5th Fl. 302 W.  
Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2770  
Phone: (317) 232-6309  
Fax: (317) 232-7979  
Email: [scott.barnhart@atg.in.gov](mailto:scott.barnhart@atg.in.gov)

  
Matthew Michaloski  
Deputy Attorney General  
Indiana Atty. No. 35313-49  
Indiana Government Center South – 5th Fl. 302 W.  
Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2770  
Phone: (317) 234-1479  
Fax: (317) 232-7979  
Email: [matthew.michaloski@atg.in.gov](mailto:matthew.michaloski@atg.in.gov)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Indiana*

FOR PLAINTIFF COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY:

DANIEL CAMERON  
Attorney General

J. Christian Lewis  
Commissioner of the Office of Consumer Protection



[Christian.Lewis@ky.gov](mailto:Christian.Lewis@ky.gov)

Philip R. Heleringer, Executive Director of the Office of Consumer Protection

[Philip.Heleringer@ky.gov](mailto:Philip.Heleringer@ky.gov)

Jonathan E. Farmer, Deputy Executive Director of the Office of Consumer Protection

[Jonathan.Farmer@ky.gov](mailto:Jonathan.Farmer@ky.gov)

Office of the Attorney General, Commonwealth of Kentucky

1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200

Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Tel: 502-696-5300

*Attorneys for Commonwealth of Kentucky*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF LOUISIANA:

HON. JEFF LANDRY  
ATTORNEY GENERAL, STATE OF LOUISIANA  
Michael Dupree  
Christopher J. Alderman  
1885 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

s/ James R. Dugan, II  
James R. Dugan, II (*pro hac vice*)  
TerriAnne Benedetto (*pro hac vice*)  
The Dugan Law Firm  
365 Canal Street  
One Canal Place, Suite 1000  
New Orleans, LA 70130 PH:  
(504) 648-0180  
FX: (504) 649-0181  
EM: [jdugan@dugan-lawfirm.com](mailto:jdugan@dugan-lawfirm.com)  
[tbenedetto@dugan-lawfirm.com](mailto:tbenedetto@dugan-lawfirm.com)

James Williams  
CHEHARDY SHERMAN WILLIAM, LLP  
Galleria Boulevard, Suite 1100  
Metairie, LA 70001  
PH: (504) 833-5600  
FX: (504) 833-8080  
EM: [jmw@chehardy.com](mailto:jmw@chehardy.com)

*Attorneys for the State of Louisiana*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MISSISSIPPI:

LYNN FITCH, ATTORNEY GENERAL  
STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

By: /s/ Hart Martin  
Hart Martin  
Consumer Protection Division Mississippi  
Attorney General's Office Post Office Box 220  
Jackson, Mississippi 39205  
Telephone: 601-359-4223  
Fax: 601-359-4231  
[Hart.martin@ago.ms.gov](mailto:Hart.martin@ago.ms.gov)

*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Mississippi*



FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MISSOURI:

ANDREW BAILEY  
Attorney General

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amy Haywood".

[Amy.Haywood@ago.mo.gov](mailto:Amy.Haywood@ago.mo.gov)  
Missouri Attorney General's Office  
P.O. Box 899  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102  
Tel: 816-889-3090

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Missouri*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MONTANA:

AUSTIN KNUDSEN  
Montana Attorney General

*/s/ David M.S. Dewhirst*  
DAVID M.S. DEWHIRST  
Solicitor General  
P.O. Box 200151  
Helena, MT 59620-0151  
Phone: (406) 444-4500  
Fax: (406) 442-1894  
[david.dewhirst@mt.gov](mailto:david.dewhirst@mt.gov)  
[mmattioli@mt.gov](mailto:mmattioli@mt.gov)

*/s/ Charles J. Cooper* Charles J.  
Cooper [ccooper@cooperkirk.com](mailto:ccooper@cooperkirk.com)  
David H. Thompson  
[dthompson@cooperkirk.com](mailto:dthompson@cooperkirk.com) Brian  
W. Barnes [bbarnes@cooperkirk.com](mailto:bbarnes@cooperkirk.com)  
Harold S. Reeves  
[hreeves@cooperkirk.com](mailto:hreeves@cooperkirk.com) COOPER  
& KIRK PLLC  
1523 New Hampshire Avenue, NW Washington DC  
20036  
Phone: (202) 220-9620  
Fax: (202) 220-9601

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Montana*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NEVADA:

AARON D. FORD  
Attorney General  
ERNEST D. FIGUEROA  
Consumer Advocate

/s/ Michelle C. Newman

Michelle C. Newman, Senior Deputy  
Attorney General

[mnewman@ag.nv.gov](mailto:mnewman@ag.nv.gov)

Lucas J. Tucker (NV Bar No. 10252)

Senior Deputy Attorney General

[LTucker@ag.nv.gov](mailto:LTucker@ag.nv.gov)

Office of the Nevada Attorney General

100 N. Carson St.

Carson City, Nevada 89701 Tel:

(775) 684-1100

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Nevada*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA:

DREW H. WRIGLEY  
**STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA**  
Attorney General

By: /s/ Elin S. Alm  
Parrell D. Grossman, ND ID 04684 Elin S.  
Alm, ND ID 05924  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Consumer Protection & Antitrust Division Office of  
Attorney General of North Dakota  
1720 Burlington Drive, Suite C, Bismarck, ND 58503-7736 (701)  
328-5570  
(701) 328-5568 (fax)  
[pgrossman@nd.gov](mailto:pgrossman@nd.gov) [eam@nd.gov](mailto:eam@nd.gov)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of North Dakota*

FOR PLAINTIFF COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO:

/s/ Domingo Emanuelli-Hernández

Domingo Emanuelli-Hernández

Attorney General

Thaizza Rodríguez Pagán

Assistant Attorney General

PR Bar No. 17177

P.O. Box 9020192

San Juan, Puerto Rico 00902-0192 Tel:

(787) 721-2900, ext. 1201, 1204

[trodriguez@justicia.pr.gov](mailto:trodriguez@justicia.pr.gov)

Kyle G. Bates

HAUSFELD LLP

600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3200

San Francisco, CA 94111

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Commonwealth of Puerto Rico*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA:

ALAN WILSON  
Attorney General

/s/ Mary Frances Jowers  
Rebecca M. Hartner (S.C. Bar No. 101302)  
Assistant Attorney General  
W. Jeffrey Young  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
C. Havird Jones, Jr.  
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
Mary Frances Jowers  
Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
South Carolina Attorney General's Office  
P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1549  
Phone: 803-734-3970  
Email: [rhartner@scag.gov](mailto:rhartner@scag.gov)  
[mfjowers@scag.gov](mailto:mfjowers@scag.gov)

Charlie Condon  
Charlie Condon Law Firm, LLC  
880 Johnnie Dodds Blvd, Suite 1  
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464 Phone:  
843-884-8146  
Email: [charlie@charliecondon.com](mailto:charlie@charliecondon.com)

James R. Dugan, II (*pro hac vice*)  
The Dugan Law Firm  
365 Canal Street  
One Canal Place, Suite 1000  
New Orleans, LA 70130 Phone:  
(504) 648-0180  
Email: [jdugan@dugan-lawfirm.com](mailto:jdugan@dugan-lawfirm.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of South Carolina*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA:

MARTY JACKLEY  
Attorney General

/s/ Yvette K. Lafrentz Yvette  
K. Lafrentz Assistant  
Attorney General  
Consumer Protection Division  
South Dakota Office of the Attorney General  
1302 E. Hwy. 14, Suite 1  
Pierre, SD 57501  
P: 605.773.3215 F:605.773.4106  
[Yvette.lafrentz@state.sd.us](mailto:Yvette.lafrentz@state.sd.us)

*Attorney for Plaintiff State of South Dakota*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF UTAH:

Sean D. Reyes  
Utah Attorney General

/s/ Tara Pincock

Tara Pincock  
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Section Office of  
the Utah Attorney General  
160 E 300 S, 5th Floor  
PO Box 140874  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872 Telephone:  
385-881-3958  
Fax: 801-366-0315

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Utah and as counsel for the Utah Division of Consumer Protection*

**PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. P. Kevin Castel  
United States District Court  
Southern District of New York